

Application No. 10/772,430
Amendment dated September 25, 2007
Reply to Office Action of June 25, 2007

Docket No. 0505-1266PUS1
Art Unit: 3714
Page 11 of 22

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Nine (9) Sheets of Replacement Drawings (FIGS. 9-17) are attached at the end of this Amendment. Several reference numerals have been changed so that each designated element is referred to by a unique reference numeral. No new matter has been added.

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 1, 4-7, and 11-13 are amended, and claims 15-19 are added. Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 11, and 13 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

Drawings

Nine (9) Sheets of Replacement Drawings (FIGS. 9-17) are attached at the end of this Amendment. Several reference numerals have been changed so that each designated element is referred to by a unique reference numeral. No new matter has been added.

Claim for Priority

The Examiner has acknowledged the Applicants' claim for foreign priority.

Information Disclosure Citation

The Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the reference supplied with the Information Disclosure Statements filed February 6, 2004, August 31, 2005, and November 16, 2005, and for providing the Applicants with initialed copies of the PTO forms filed therewith.

Substitute Specification

In accordance with MPEP §608.01(q), the Applicants herewith submit a substitute specification in the above-identified application. Also included is a marked-up copy of the original specification which shows the portions of the original specification which are being added and deleted. The Applicants respectfully submit that the substitute specification includes no new matter and that the substitute specification includes the same changes as are indicated in the marked-up copy of the original specification showing additions and deletions.

Because the number of amendments which are being made to the original specification would render it difficult to consider the case, or to arrange the papers for printing or copying, the Applicants have voluntarily submitted this substitute specification. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the substitute specification be entered into the application.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 4 and 12 because of several informalities. In order to overcome this objection, the Applicants have amended claims 4 and 12 in order to correct the deficiencies pointed out by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicants have amended claim 11 to recite wherein the click generating means comprises a ball member and triangular cover member provided with a hole portion in which the steel ball is engaged when said gear change pedal is in a center position.

Support for this amendment can be seen in FIGS. 14-17 and paragraphs [00179] to [00185]

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a)

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yamazaki (U.S. Patent No. 5,547,382);

claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McDowell (U.S. Patent No. 6,083,1060 in view of Yamazaki;

claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Semenik et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,133,657);

claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Clarkson (U.S. Patent No. 6,122,991);

claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Schneider (U.S. Patent No. 4,727,765); and

claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Tosaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,989,123).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amendments to Independent Claim 1

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, independent claim 1 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a riding simulation system, including

a frame body having at least two main frames, wherein said steering handle mechanism is mounted at upper portions of the at least two main frames and the connection shaft is mounted to lower portions of the at least two main frames.

By contrast, as can be seen in McDowell FIG. 4, this document merely discloses steering wheel input device 28 and right and left arm members 21, 22 connected to cross member 27 which extends horizontally in a width direction of the simulator.

Yamazaki was cited merely to disclose a brake pedal and gear change pedal, and as such, cannot make up for the deficiencies of McDowell.

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including McDowell and Yamazaki.

Therefore, independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Amendments to Independent Claim 5

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, independent claim 5 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a riding simulation system, including

wherein the bracket includes a pair of brackets,

wherein each of the brackets includes a recess on an inner surface thereof, and when the brackets are mated together, the recesses of the mating brackets form a space in which the vibrator is disposed.

Support for the novel features of claim 5 can be seen in the application as originally filed, for example, in FIGS. 9-11.

The Examiner concedes that neither Yamazaki nor Semenik et al. disclose a tapered bracket. In addition, Yamazaki FIG. 36 merely discloses a motor 175e fitted in the handle end 175c and is fixed with an end cap 175d. As for Semenik et al., this document merely discloses a bracket 224 with side members 260, 261 for holding sides of a cylindrical shaped vibrator. Side members 260, 261 are not mated together, as required by independent claim 5.

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 5 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Yamazaki in view of Semenik et al.

Therefore, independent claim 5 is in condition for allowance.

Amendments to Independent Claim 6

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, independent claim 6 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a riding simulation system, including

a bracket having an enclosed cylindrical space, the bracket being screw-engaged with an end portion of a steering handle pipe constituting said steering handle mechanism, wherein said vibrator is inserted into the inside of said steering handle pipe in the state of being held by said bracket,

wherein the vibrator includes an eccentrically mounted weight extending from an outer end of the vibrator so as to be disposed in the enclosed cylindrical space.

Support for the novel features of claim 6 can be seen in FIGS. 12 and 13.

The Examiner concedes that Yamazaki fails to disclose a vibrator held in place by a bracket that is screw engaged with the end portion of the steering handle. As for Semenik et al., this document merely discloses a horizontal member 273 and a vertical extending member 274, and as such Semenik et al. fails to teach eccentrically mounted weight extending from an outer end of the vibrator so as to be disposed in the enclosed cylindrical space, as required by independent claim 6.

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 6 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Yamazaki Semenik et al.

Therefore, independent claim 6 is in condition for allowance.

Amendments to Independent Claim 7

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, independent claim 7 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a riding simulation system, including

wherein the bracket includes a pair of brackets,

wherein each of the brackets includes a recess on an inner surface thereof, and when the brackets are mated together, the recesses of the mating brackets form a space in which the vibrator is disposed.

By contrast, as can be seen in Yamazaki FIG. 36, this document merely discloses a motor 175e fitted in the handle end 175c and is fixed with an end cap 175d.

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 7 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Yamazaki.

Therefore, independent claim 7 is in condition for allowance.

Amendments to Independent Claim 11

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, independent claim 11 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a riding simulation system, including

wherein the click generating means comprises a ball member and triangular cover member provided with a hole portion in which the steel ball is engaged when said gear change pedal is in a center position.

The Examiner concedes that Yamazaki fails to disclose a click generating means. As for Schneider, this document merely discloses ball 13 biased against a catch recess 14 formed on an outer surface of hub 3 of the gearshift.

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 11 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Yamazaki in view of Schneider.

Therefore, independent claim 11 is in condition for allowance.

Amendments to Independent Claim 13

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, independent claim 13 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a riding simulation system, including

a frame portion including a plurality of main frames for supporting said steering handle shaft portion, and

a single spring for giving a reaction force in a direction opposite to the turning direction of said steering handle when said steering handle is operated, wherein said single spring is provided with a pair of clamping portions projected outwards from said steering handle shaft portion so as to clamp external surfaces of one of the main frames therebetween.

The Examiner concedes that Yamazaki fails to disclose a single spring for giving a reaction force in a direction opposite the turning direction.

As for Tosaki et al., this document merely discloses torsion spring 52 having ends 52a and 52b abutting, respectively, upon stoppers 50, 51 and protrusions 55, 56

At least for the reasons explained above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 13 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Yamazaki in view of Tosaki et al.

Therefore, independent claim 13 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims

The Examiner will note that dependent claim 4 and 12 have been amended, and dependent claims 15-19 have been added.

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 208-4030(direct line).

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Date: September 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By



James M. Slattery

Reg. No. 28,380

P. O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

for ✓

#43,362

JMS:CTT:ktp



Attachments: Substitute Specification
Nine (9) Sheets of Replacement Drawings